

Wednesday, January 25, 1967

Palo Alto Open Meeting



Mr. Nyland: Now some of you were in Berkeley last night and then we ended kind of saying that we would continue; of course you know we won't continue --- we'll start all over again. For instance, with Barbara, you had a date, didn't you?

Barbara Resen: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: How did it work?

Barbara: Um, I think I became aware of alot of things, really aware of them.

Mr. Nyland: And you were a little less, less tense: was it that way?

Barbara: Um, I was very tired so there was much more tension in my body. But I was aware of the difference between um . . .

Mr. Nyland: ()

Barbara: . . . the action . . .

Mr. Nyland: Reality settles with ()

Barbara: But what I did was to um, find certain muscles in my arms and my legs that were tense, I'd relax them and then tense them up again to see the difference. I found that whatever I was doing, I mean if I was just sitting in a chair and, and folding my leg, um, there was tension in the bottom of my feet and everywhere.

Mr. Nyland: Terrible, isn't it?

Barbara: Yes, it really is.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, and think of the amount of energy that goes there, completely useless.

Barbara: Yeah, I, I realize that in the kind of relief I felt when I relaxed, it was really so different.

Mr. Nyland: Continue; I'll see you again, when, Monday?

Barbara: Tomorrow, Friday.

Nyland: Oh, Friday, ah, good, fine (). Tomorrow is another day.

Barbara: All right.

Mr. Nyland: And who else? Who, who, ask somebody. Oh, you, huh. What will you talk about (). After the meeting, alright?

So now the deck is cleared, and we have no obligations to ask from people who have done something that they should report on. So now we can talk about anything you like. Are there any questions since last night that you could hook onto? Or how will we do it? You know it's always who has read something, who wants to know a little more, who finds that what they have read is not clear? And what is really the meaning of work on oneself? So now, out of that what will we talk . . .

Question: I would be interested to know whether you know the work of Sir Paul Duke, if you've read his book, and . . .

Mr. Nyland: I don't know much about it, no. Can you tell us?

Q. Well, I studied Yoga under him in South Africa for awhile.

Mr. Nyland: Well, Yoga. . .

Q. He was a student of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky.

Mr. Nyland: I don't know, I don't think so, I think he knew about them.

Q. Well, he met them.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, yes, that's all.

Q. And he was with them in Paris.

Mr. Nyland: Lots of people went to Paris and you might say to study with Gurdjieff was almost an impossibility. Gurdjieff in that way didn't teach. Ouspensky is different.

Q. Yes.

Mr. Nyland: If he was in England at the time Ouspensky was there that would be, but still then Yoga is not Gurdjieff, you know that?

Q. Right.

Mr. Nyland: And I'm always a little leery about Yoga.

Q. Could you perhaps tell me why? Perhaps answer other questions?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I'm afraid, I'm afraid, I'm afraid that Yoga emphasizes only one center in the sense Gurdjieff means it. That sometimes Yoga includes another center but very seldom is a third center engaged in it; it's mostly intellectual, sometimes a little physical, purely in certain forms of behavior, and there's no doubt that by means of Yoga one can reach a certain state in which there is a disappearance of ordinary bondage of earth, and definitely a possibility of linking up with something of a higher force or a higher nature. Well, in that sense then a man is only partly developed and is not a full man anymore, again in the sense of Gurdjieff, because for Gurdjieff it is necessary not to follow any of the one, two, or three ways as you probably know Ouspensky calls them, but a fourth way, which would mean a development simultaneously of all centers, in order to produce or to create out of that a harmonious man. And that ~~he~~, from the standpoint of Gurdjieff, a Yoga is not harmonious. He is a ~~god~~ ^{god} man, and he's part of a man, and he has reached a certain experience which for him is extremely useful, but as far as man on earth is concerned, he has separated a little bit from the rest of humanity and therefore it would be very difficult for him to adapt himself to the conditions of ordinary life, so that if he would want to become conscious, then he would have to develop half of his intellect, also his physical center, like a fakir, or his emotional center, like a saint. And that if he could do that it would be very wonderful, but the difficulty is that ~~he~~ ^{one} starts to concentrate on one center, mostly. Usually it will go at the expense of the development of the others, and that will make an over-development of one, which would mean an underdevelopment of the others. And that a great deal of the energy that goes to the development of one center is taking away even

from the possibility of the other centers remaining normal.

So you see, you get, as it were, a leoparded man. It is only the definition of what one wishes to become and of course, there's no objection to becoming a Yogi if that is the aim of having contact with a higher force and to find in that satisfaction for one's own life. So there is no particular reason to say it is no good only when the emphasis is on becoming a man, and staying a man on earth. And in that sense remaining as man on earth, harmonious, which means simply to be in balance or to be able to do whatever is required to be done as a Yogi is really a man very much like a person who shuts himself up in an ivory tower. You see there's no criticism, only in the sense of Gurdjieff, as man, for him, not a man, since he's not complete.

Q. You are saying that Yogis generally tend to be ~~too~~ withdrawn from everyday life?

Mr. Nyland: I'm afraid so. That is, too withdrawn if he wants to become more in touch with ordinary life in a physical sense as a manifestation, then he becomes withdrawn in his emotional center. Now don't misunderstand me, there are several ways of Yoga. Now we can try one after the other, but it is not simultaneous, and I think if one tries one, again, it will go at the expense of the other. Much of the things that are done with the physical body, like breathing, or particular things that are necessary in order to fix, as it were, one's physical center under the influence of whatever the mind should dictate can be extremely useful for the person who does it, but he's not equipped as a man, in my opinion. One can verify it, the difficulty is that if you do, you have to spend a great many years in becoming a Yogi, many years; and then in the meantime, I think you miss out a little bit on the other.

Question II: I have two questions. The first one was, you speak of harmonious development of the three centers simultaneously. My understand

ing was that in the Gurdjieff system you begin with the physical body, and you may stay there for as long as five years, or even more.

Mr. Nyland: No, who said that?

Question II: It's only my own understanding, and that's why it's probably incorrect.

Mr. Nyland: No, I think you may explain a misunderstanding. The question of Gurdjieff is that one tries to wake up, that of course is the aim, and also in the process of wanting to wake up and following a certain method there then is the possibility of the three centers developing to its full size, or rather, to its full possibility of developing. In that way, if you understand the three centers, your physical, you understand what is meant? Physical is simply the body as it is with the organs that are in it. Feeling center is a particular kind of organ mostly located in the solar plexus, which functions, of course, in the sense of having feelings, rates of vibrations. And then the mind which is, then, intellectual center located in the brain. None of them is really a center. The physical center as a whole is the totality of the body, it's not a center. You can call it a center if you like, but anyhow, it's predominant. The solar plexus is not really a center because much of the solar plexus is really distributed over the rest of the body, it's only a few that are centered in a certain place; but the rest as nerve nodes which function as feeling center ends are in the rest of the body, and the center is not focussed --- very hard to see.

The intellectual center as a body, as a part of the possibility of the body, being located in the brain, is more of a center because it is centered in the brain. But one wouldn't call it really a center, because it is not central to the different things, it is at the end of a variety of different () and nerves () the brain in a certain way; and of course the brain has a certain function to fulfill.

Now from the standpoint of Gurdjieff the three centers are not

equally developed. Physical center is completely developed up to the point of dying. The feeling center is only half developed. And the intellectual center is only very little bit developed. If the possibility of growth could be indicated by octaves then that what is physical center is do-re-mi-fa-sol-la-si. Si-do, meaning the last part, going over into do, would mean the death of the body. As far as the feeling center is concerned, it's only developed do-re-mi, the first part of the octave, and after fa it is not over-bridged, and the rest of that octave, sol-la-si, of the so-called feeling or emotional center, or emotional body as it is full grown, doesn't exist. As far as the intellectual center is concerned, only thing that is struck is do. And the rest of the octave does not exist, and only could come to existence in a conscious area, I mean this is the idea.

So if one considers man potentially growing out to the full possibility of his development, he would then have three so-called bodies represented by three octaves, of which at the present time he only has one and a half, or even a little less, and that the other half, that is, the other one and a half of the totality of three bodies could be developed if man could become conscious. And it's for that possible development of his that he would have to enter a so-called conscious area as compared to where he lives now, which is an unconscious one.

Now in order to develop or to try to find out what the method is, the requirement is that I would like to become objective to myself in the different manifestations, ultimately having an aim that I will develop an intellectual body which would function intellectually. And being able in as such to observe myself as I am, and accept myself as I am, without any further questions or without any likes or dislikes; with other words, that that kind of an observation should be impartial and that also it should be guaranteed that it is simultaneous with the moment.

understanding of the moment of the existence, and it may be recorded at that same moment.

So this now leads to the possibility if I would like to become objective to myself it would mean that I would also be objective not only to my body, but also to a feeling center or the processes of the feeling, or an emotional nature, and also what is my intellectual capacity, of what I call thinking. So the totality of myself, I, if that could develop, again according to Gurdjieff, would have the possibility of observing all (). Now, if that, if it is necessary to understand that observation has to be fulfilled and can only be fulfilled when one is impartial and when one can record a certain, a certain experience at the moment when it happens, then I want to exclude as much as I can, either my feeling center or my intellectual center; and I want to have an observation which stays only within the particular prescription of an intellectual recording.

Now, if I want to become impartial while this little I, and we assume now that the little I is the beginning of something that could start to function in an objective sense and which is located in a certain part of the brain and still has the possibility of that kind of a development. That then if it starts to become observant of myself totally, I'll have a difficult time becoming objective, regarding a feeling center when it has to be impartial. And it is difficult to observe a mental function when it has to be at the moment, because the mind as it functions now is subject to time, either past or the future, but never living in the present, or not recording it. So far that reason when I want to learn what it is to become objective I try to become observant in the first place, of that what is my physical body. Now you see, that may have given the idea that one stays with the physical body for five years; of course that's nonsense. All I wish to do is to become observant of behavior forms of my physical body, and using that, simply as the object

of such observation until the I is sufficiently grown up so that, you might say, it can stand on its own feet. And then I change the object and start to see if I could become objective regarding my feeling center; and then if I could become objective regarding a mental center. So the first thing is that I have to do is to try to become objective to ordinary physical behavior forms, simply that what I know is behavior, and we say then in movements, or in gestures, or postures, or tone of voice or whatever it may be, that now is a form of behavior that I would like that the little I would like to become observant to.

How long it will take, it depends entirely on how I work, if I'm really very intense, and wish and there is a good wish, then really the time will be shorter; if I do it haphazardly then of course I cannot help, and I do not know how long it might take --- five years even, that may not be enough. Now the question is: do I try to observe myself setting out now in this particular direction as trying to develop I into a fullgrown entity which could become observant, and afterwards could become a guide for my life. Then of course, I have to have, in the first place, a good wish, I have to be clever enough to apply it in conditions where I might have success, so I don't do it in complicated states. I don't do it when I am emotionally upset. The little I would require energy for me as represented by the wish. So it would mean a division of energy between that what should go to the little I and that what still should stay for the maintenance of my body.

Now if my body is engaged in certain things, worrisome states, or thought processes of a certain kind, something that takes me up completely, there is very little energy left for the feeling of I. So in the first place I take a situation in which my ordinary existence is at a low level of existence, and still existing, and then I want to observe that particular part of myself where there are no feelings and no

intellect. In that way I could develop a certain dexterity, and having that dexterity, I could extend it further to my feeling and to my mental centers. Now if I once get through with the division of, let's say, observing movements, and I take new movements about which I have no particular feeling; ~~that is~~ ^{that is}, I'm not judging my movements when I simply walk, for the sake of getting from one place to the other, I really could be much easier impartial to it, instead of when I have to make movements which involve me; or, let's say, like an actor making certain movements or expressions on his face, where he is dependent on the applause from the audience. You see, in many of these ordinary affairs of behaving, I become identified with what I'm doing, and identification is opposite to impartiality. So for that reason I must be as simple as I can. Maybe the body has to be as relaxed as possible so as to reduce the amount of energy as represented by this wish to become observant, or to try to become conscious.

You see, now, if I start with any of the five and then gradually start to combine; that is, for one day, let's say, I will observe, I will become aware. You see, the terminology is when I am aware I am fulfilling the requirements of ~~that~~ ^{that} kind of observation and awareness is a moment of a recording in which there is impartiality; and which happens at the moment, as represented by simultaneity. So that true observation has to be impartial. True, true impartiality can only exist when I consider the moment of the experience. I call it ABC: observation, impartiality, simultaneity, instantaneity, or momentary living which every way you want to define it, if the ABC is fulfilled, that is, if the little I receives now such impressions of my body, my body as a whole, as a personality, continues to exist in an unconscious state. Again we call it unconscious because there is a possibility when the I is awake, that that would produce in me, if I

were changed enough, a condition I call conscious. The difference between one and the other, don't let's talk about that now. But in any event I assume that when I'm unconscious, I call it unconscious only when I know that there is also a conscious state possible, and I would have to define the conscious state as a result of an effort, or as the result of an experience which may have happened to me. And perhaps this last way of looking at it, that I sometimes knew that there have been states of experiences accidentally experienced, which have given me a very definite realization of my existence, in which particular state there was no functioning as far as my mind and my feelings were concerned. All I knew is that I existed and that I was alive while I was not thinking or feeling about it. This we simply call an accidental conscious state. It was not a result because I did any work, but it just happened.

Now when I know that these states exist and I call them now conscious because the consciousness for me represents a freedom from my ordinary subjectivity, I now mean the existence of my body and the way it functions with feeling center functioning the way it has, taking care of my feelings and emotions, and my mind taking care of thoughts or whatever takes place in my mind, associations or whatever now happens regarding memory, regarding anticipation, whatever I call thoughts. So whenever I now start to develop this little I, I give it, you might say, food in the form of asking it to become observant of me. And if I starts to function in that objective sense, then I distinguish between that existence, and I call it I and compare it, then, with the continued existence of myself which I then will call it. So it is then the relationship between I and it, I being conscious by definition, it remaining unconscious also by definition. Now in this particular process it, remaining unconscious, continues to exist as it always has existed; that is, it

keeps on feeling, it keeps on thinking, and it keeps on having a physical body. The blood circulates, the breathing continues, all different forms of manifestations of course continue. Again, I say, I call them unconscious because they belong to that kind of a world, and they belong to my subjectivity. The subjectivity going over into objectivity simply means that that what is objectively recorded is free from any influence from any of the other centers. So it is pure intellect, only, recording statements of facts, recording no interpretation, no wish to change, no feeling about it, no wish to classify it, no pigeon-holing, no way of associating it with other thoughts, no anticipation, no memory, only a recording. That is objectivity in the sense that I apply it to the possibility of a functioning in my brain in the particular part of the brain that, that has to learn to do this, is simply a segment of the brain, like there are many other different segments of the brain taking care of other kinds of mental functions.

Now again, if I start to develop this little I, and I, so-called, becomes now conscious of me, that what it observes, what I observe, is the manifestations of my physical body. The manifestations are a result of that what I think or feel, excepting, perhaps, a few activities that belong primarily to the body itself. But most of the time my particular behavior is determined by my feelings and very many times, immediately when I have a feeling I already manifest with my body because the relationship between feeling, as a feeling center, and that what is my physical body, is extremely close. And the other is that I act on what I think, although that may be delayed a little bit, because I may keep on thinking and finally come to the conclusion that I have to do something. But you see as long as ^{the} behavior forms are dictated by either one or the other center, not physical. I may be able by observation to trace the source of the behavior.

So there would be two ways of trying to extend my possibility of becoming conscious of the totality of myself. One is by continuing to observe that what is my physical body, and gradually shifting that what is now that object, and putting in its place the physical and emotional center or mental center. That would be one way. The other would be that I continue to observe my physical body and trace it back to the thought or the feeling which have caused my behavior the way it is. After some time if one is patient enough, that will have the possibility of becoming observant in the real sense of the word regarding the totality of myself as personality. I would almost say it's only one-third of the road one has to travel before one reaches consciousness, for man in ordinary life. Because that what I'm trying to do in the formation of I is really separate out a part of myself, to become observant of it, and in that sense it is, you might say, under that observation more or less in a very cool manner, without any feeling or any interpretation whatsoever. Naturally that's not my life. My life is based on the functioning with which I'm familiar, but I simply don't want to use them because I'm not sure that they give me accurate facts; and the intention is that I try to, to collect as many absolute facts as I possibly can, about which there is no argument, or no possible misinterpretation.

This of course I always do when I look at myself, or think about myself or feel about myself, and in that sense of course, I'm not true, I know I'm not true. I know that I am a bad reporter for myself, for sometimes I cannot stand what I see or what I would actually do. So objectivity would involve that development of something that gives me accurate data about myself. But that of course is not enough because it does not change my behavior forms, and they would remain still subjective.

It will take me much too long to explain it, but in a general way the question of subjectivity is by itself not bad, because it belongs to earth, and it belongs to me as a personality. It's only when I become interested in the possibility of freedom from this earth that I'm thinking and trying to think about objectivity. But as long as I'm satisfied by remaining bound on earth, and at the end of my life dying, I have no desire to become even objective, or that I think about a possibility of that. You see the reason for a person to become interested in Gurdjieff is that he is dissatisfied with the way he is, and probably he has tried already many different ways of how to find out how to get out of it. And that maybe he has been quite religious, or that he has tried to find it in the direction of art or philosophy or maybe science. But in any event, he must have found that he couldn't do it. Any person who can do it in any other way I don't think would be interested in Gurdjieff at all, because I think it is extremely difficult to become objective to oneself, and there are many obstacles in the way. And unless I have a perfectly good reason to try to overcome them, I wouldn't bother about them, if I think that it is an easier way. If I just read the Upanishads or (); or that perhaps by studying the Bible I also can become a good man; or that by going to a psychoanalysis, and so forth, that I would find certain things out about my behavior; and that perhaps because of that I would be forewarned, and then have the strength to change certain forms of behavior. I think I will go to almost any length in order to find the line of least resistance, which does not require too much energy on my part. And if I think ultimately that I can get it by prayer, I probably would prefer that, instead of doing work.

It all depends. Because if one becomes, on that particular road, one way or the other dissatisfied, as it doesn't seem to solve all the problems that one has or alleviate suffering, or does not help me in my

relationship with other people; or that I, at times knowing that I'm subjective, that I'm completely bound and cannot find any way out, then perhaps I will try to look in the direction of objectivity, and not before. It is much too difficult, and involves for one the possibility of something, either I don't think I have, or maybe I don't want; or if I have it, I don't want to talk about it.

It has to do with the inner life of man, and naturally the assumption that a man is not everything that he is, that he is appearing to be; that is that what man is as a manifestation, and as we know him, and see him, of course has to have something in him that makes the motivation for the wish for him to continue to live. And it depends entirely now on where this wish is: if the wish is on the periphery and if a man is satisfied with the ordinary affairs of life on the surface only, and doesn't allow anything to penetrate too deeply, for whatever reason, he of course has very little of what might be called a spiritual development within himself. And maybe he doesn't even know that he has an inner life. Then only sometimes does he say, Well, I really mean it. The question is always if one is living by one's own manifestations, and accept people in that same way, and that not much of one's feeling is involved, and that sometimes when the feelings appear and they are a little too deep that one becomes afraid of them, and covers them up.

That one ^{really} doesn't want to think sufficiently, to think through, to think until one has exhausted the possibility of ever reaching a solution by means of thinking. But that many times one gives up; and that the kind of thinking that is being taught is usually nothing else but an accumulation of data. And I'm now talking about average people who of course are quite satisfied with the way they are; and only perhaps a very few are interested in the possible development of themselves in the spiritual sense.

And if they believe in a possibility of that kind of growth, they

have to believe in the growth of that what is their emotional center or their intellectual center, cause there is nothing to grow any more as far as physical, physical, their physical appearance is concerned.

So again, you see the reason why a person might be interested in work on himself a la Gurdjieff, simply means that he ~~x~~has to be quite sure that he has something to start with. And that what in man now is his spiritual life, his inner life; perhaps sometimes he calls it essence; sometimes it's called his own reality; sometimes he calls it his private life, because he doesn't want to talk about it. It also means that I have to start in that way to see if the possibility of a development of that what is not as yet developed, and I first have to believe that I'm not as yet developed. I have to know that I'm in the sense of three bodies (). I also have to believe that there is a possibility of an evolution for man; that is is logical to think; that that it has a place in his life; that he knows that as far as ~~xx~~ his particular condition on earth is concerned, that it would be idiotic to assume that a person simply dies and nothing is left. Or that where ever he comes from, that all of a sudden life appears in the form of a human being and at death it disappears, or that when he looks around and is a little philosophical that there are certain things outside of the earth --- the planets for one--- the solar system as we know it, or as it is our solar system, the possibility of all the different heavenly bodies in the sky and the universe thinking about what is space or time or perhaps God, or perhaps His Endlessness or Absolute-ness, or relationships or that ^{what} is (), that what if ().

What is man in his work, what are his cells, his molecules, his atomic structure, all the different things that I can uncover scientifically? They must have some kind of a meaning; which of course it just didn't happen all of a sudden. Now maybe I don't have to assume

that all of that was directed by some kind of a manager, I call God, who has taken care of the world, and created it. I may not believe what it says in the Bible or at least I can call it allegorical. And maybe there are certain systems that are more satisfactory to me, but, you see, all of that in one's particular development must lead to the possibility of believing that there is something outside of us and that maybe we are in some way connected with it and that it is our problem to see in how far we can understand it. So that really a man is concerned about finding out his place in this world and the meaning of his own existence, and the reason of course why I was born. And now why he wants to take the responsibility of the continuation of his life and of course he cannot help thinking about what will happen to me after I die.

I think all these questions have to be considered first and they can be considered without ever dreaming about objectivity. The assumption I would say is this: that if I really want to become interested in Gurdjieffian ideas, I have to settle a great many things beforehand, before I'm even equipped to do anything about my own life. And if I cannot place it and it is not intellectual, it's a question many times of feeling where one is and the place one has and what one is as a human being. And when I consider how I am with other people and that I know that I'm very much afraid sometimes of showing what I am, at the same time I also feel, and sometimes I get emotionally disturbed, and I cannot place the reasons why I have fear, why I cannot say certain things at a certain time, that I really want to say it. And that many things as far as earth is concerned, of course, gradually run down, and I cannot do anything about it. And apparently I'm part of it because I run down and in the end I die. The problems of life, and of death, the problems of a relationship between people, the problems of

thinking certain thoughts, of thinking in the sense that I want to create something like writing a book or that what is an art for me, and the creation of that what I now wish to make, for whatever reason, self-expression, or the glorification of God, or the possibility in me of developing something that is inherent in me, and that I know that I take on as a responsibility with myself at the same time.

When I start to take care of my self physically by eating, drinking, and sleeping, there is something in man that has to be there. You might call it conscience. That for a little while he may not know exactly what to do, and then after some time, living on this earth in certain conditions and in certain regions, that he will develop something that he calls his conscience. And most likely it is something that is inherent in the civilization or the culture he happens to live in.

We call it morality of course, of a certain form of behavior, sometimes affects, sometimes we have a law to make sure that a person is staying within that law, and all the different relationships that we have among different people on earth. I think it is quite right, and to read about it and to live and to find out how far you can go, and that you don't get burned. But you see all of that has nothing to do with the possibility of a spiritual development and it is not for the reason that I want to become a better man on earth. Primarily it is for the reason that I know that there is a responsibility in me which I cannot really define until I see that there is something that's in me that's much more of value than the ordinary affairs of ordinary life.

And then it is easy to come to the conclusion that when I discover that in myself that I start to evaluate it, put more and when it has more of a value that I have to become much more concerned that it should remain existing. And particularly when I feel that in doing a certain amount of, let's say, work, not on myself, but I try to develop certain

things, that I take the responsibility seriously, and that with doing that, naturally, that I would like to have that what I make continue to exist.

And that I don't think it is ~~xxx~~ fair that a man dies after he has tried honestly to live as well as he can. That it is almost unjust of God if he believes in Him that I would die, and everything would be forgotten and that then I would go up into infinity. Logically I don't think a person would really be satisfied with that thought. He will constantly try to find if there is not a way out, to find, even, you might say, the way to God, to ask him if it is fair, and to see if there is, by means of some kind of communication the possibility of finding an answer.

All of this, you see, again is preliminary to work, because only I will work when I believe in the possibility of that kind of development which has nothing to do with my physical body. And that finally the aim is that if I could become objective, I would release the bondage of my physical body and my personality in order to continue to exist in a different way. And perhaps an existence which may be partly already actualized in this life, and maybe might continue after I die.

I say all kind of philosophical questions come up, and sometimes religion tries to help and talks about heaven, talks about a life here-after, talks about spirits. Talks about the possibility of even communicating. Many so-called spiritualists are those who --- even very religious, sometimes mystics --- who believe in the possibility of a contact, and then come back and tell us about it. And also () really want to tell how it was and why, and the different parapsychology, and all the extrasensory perceptions, and all the different ways of media and so forth. And what is there in a real psychological murder? I'm not discussing it because in my opinion, of course there's no question about the existence of worlds. The existence of the continuation of life, of life existing all eternal, never, never dying because it cannot die; it

is a matter of life. And that we as living beings simply temporarily take on a certain coating and represent life then in this form. And when the body dies life continues but when I wake I become attached to the form of life that I now represent; and for that reason I would like to continue if there is any possibility with that kind of an entity, you might say, which is me, provided I become sufficiently free of myself. And I would understand the totality of all life if I am part. That then ultimately it would have to join such totality without any further distinction, becoming that what is all existing as a being of life; again it remains much too much of that kind of a philosophy and at the same time I think it is very very necessary that one knows a little bit about it before one ever tries to become conscious about one's self.

Consciousness is a serious question and of course to some extent I would like to become conscious in order to relieve myself; or to become free from certain things that I don't like for the present time; or really to have an ulterior motive that I might become a better man. I think the desire for consciousness is, in the first place, to be awake, as if in that conscious state I will experience certain things which I cannot experience in my unconscious state; and that then, being conscious, being awake, that then I would see what has to be done, assuming then that that level of consciousness is of course above or at least free from that what is on earth, and that then I will understand what may on earth seem accident --- that that is in accordance with certain laws.

So now we come back again. The little I is developed sufficiently and is now ready to retain its objectivity. Now it has to return to earth, as it were; that is, it has to come back to the manifestations of one's body. This particular step is called participation. The I

and the It have to join and the It has to be affected by the qualities of I, so that ultimately the totality of man as personality could become conscious, could develop a real conscience, and would have a real will, all of this under the influence of I. *

Again it is an open question: what this I is. I simply say it is an entity that starts to function, for that participation process means I return to that what is my manifestation, the way I am, this time guided by the objectivity of I. It's a very important realization ~~that~~ that as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, it never gets stuck on observation only, and that it does not lead to anything that is not warm enough; because it looks like cold observation; but in going back to that what I am, I would have to be present to my mind as a function, it would have to be present to my feeling, and its particular function either in solar plexus or perhaps heart; and that it also would have to influence what I now call ordinary wishes as expressed by my body, to go into the direction of real will.

Again this particular thing --- it would take a long time to explain it --- but that what takes place, if I return to the body, if I returns to It, you might say. It is very much as if in a particular section of the brain, which is now functioning in an objective sense, there is a certain spreading of that kind of existence to the rest of the brain. And that gradually --- I usually compare it to yeast influence --- gradually the brain starts to develop a little differently because of the influence of this form of, let's call it, light. Objectivity is light when it is awakened state as compared to unconsciousness which is then half way sleeping-waking, and that is (). So whenever light is introduced into a dark state, it has to become more and more light if the effect is persistent; and that it might have to go through stages of twilight: it simply means,

ultimately, that it will have to reach the stage of daylight at mid-day, if I compare my state of unconsciousness with a state of darkness, as if it is midnight.

That then the process of wishing to develop by means of I which has form, has been (), is a process of gradual change from a man, from unconscious to consciousness. And if he is living for twelve hours from midnight to midday --- and this particular process the development of that kind of consciousness, that is, a changing over or a conversion from his unconscious state into a conscious function --- of course will take time.

And that in the meantime simultaneous to that there is an influence from the mind on the heart, the heart becoming now gradually the particular seat for the center of one's emotions, and are distinguished between feelings belonging to an unconscious state, and emotions belonging to a conscious state. Also that the place changes from solar plexus to heart, and that the real conscience is located in one's heart which then in its turn becomes the central point for the development of man in the development of his ~~next~~ next body, which of course the Gurdjieffers call Keesdjan; it is emotional body. It is as if one could imagine a certain body very similar to what we have as physical body being within that body but consisting of the substance which is lighter in ~~xxxxxx~~ density, emotional in quality. It is called Keesdjan. And inside of that a Soul body, again of lighter quality, but that would be the intellectual capacities of man (). The beginning of his consciousness would lead man to the development of an intellectual body. His conscience will be of help in the development of his emotional body to its full-grownness, and that what is will is a result of his consciousness and conscience, now becoming active in physical body.

At the same time, you say I'm sorry, because there are so many things that relate to this, of course I cannot say the different things in an hour and a half. You see it is so difficult to select. And partly I'm afraid that I'm already overloading it. There are other facts that are not related from you and at the same time I cannot help it. Once I remember we talked, when was it, in Berkeley; I tried to condense All and Everything in an hour and a half. Absolute stupidity.

Don't you see here how we talk about conscience and consciousness, and what is it really that we wish to know? How can a man become a Man. How is he really at the present time, unconscious as he is and completely satisfactory as far as the rest of the world is concerned, what can he do about himself and how can he really become a Man and in the sense now ~~xxx~~ that a Man knows what to do or how to do. Or a Man is a being who can do, who knows what to do, who has intellect and enough emotion to drive himself or to have the insight together with his emotion, his aspiration and inspiration for him to be able really to feel and to feel independently of his body. And to have the possibility when he wishes contact with others to live at three different levels at the same time. That would be a Man. If he could have contact, unity, if necessary, intellectually, on the basis of an understanding. That he could have an emotional capacity of understanding emotionally in his realization of an emotional existence of someone else.

And of course, as far as his physical body is concerned he has a little bit of an understanding of physical unity, not very much but at least it is satisfactory enough. Surely it is satisfactory enough to produce children. But emotional unity, where have we got it? It is not there and only what I say once in a while what I feel, or I

say I love, and the love itself, by itself without any physical expression practically never exists. Intellectually it leads to argument. An argument should always be there because no intellect is the same as any other intellect. There should not be any argument that prevents unity. But the realization has to come that I understand that what is the reasoning of the other and I will make that allowance when I understand him, even if the conclusion is not the same.

Again, you see, emotionally it is another question. There can never be an argument about emotion, that has to be 100%. If that isn't there, the emotions are not united; there is only the possibility of becoming really one when there is no further question. Emotionally we don't know what it means. The trouble is that emotions become much more important even than intellect and body, and if man is made up of the three centers, as he is unconsciously, he represents now a person in which that which is his body is positive and his mind is negative. It's partly because there is very little of his mind and partly because his body, of course, is so predominant.

As far as conscience and consciousness is concerned, the requirement is that his mind, as consciousness, becomes positive. That is, physical body becomes negative. That is, it will become a servant. It will have, perhaps, a certain little bit of will of its own, but it is always under the influence and surely under the ordering of that which is intellectually correct. It is head, hand or feet, and heart. Man is that threefoldness, you might say. The lowest is the representation of his physical body. The center is his emotional life. The top, of course, is his intellect. The balance in man, unconsciously or consciously, is always in the center of his emotion. It is balanced by that what is his mind and what is his feet, or physical center. It doesn't matter, for the balance, if one or the other is positive. And, uncon-

scious, a man can be in equilibrium, when what is the central point of his direction of life is emotionally correct. You see, for that one doesn't need objectivity. But in order to free man, as he is, with his tendencies which all the time go in the direction of his physical body, it is necessary that that which is now positive becomes negative. That what is negative has to become positive. The balance remains the same, the emotions remain still in the middle, in the center.

The difficulty is always with ordinary man in his unconscious state, that his emotions and his feelings always go towards his feet, and get stuck at his sense organ. This is the trouble with man, everything is translated, and is considered the highest form of one's life. And of course it takes the highest form of the food that he takes. But he gets stuck and he cannot see straight. Conscious man should have his emotion go towards his face. (So that) there is a complete road between that which is real consciousness and real conscience. And again, without conflict, this time produced by that which is the form of life in the so-called Keadjanian body which Gurdjieff calls Hanbladzein. It is a substance similar to blood which starts to function in an emotional sense[?], and can produce a direct route between the mind, as consciousness, and the conscience. This never exists in an unconscious man. There is no relation between his mind and his feeling and many times there is a conflict that can never be solved. The only time that I knew about it is that it will go via my body because my body will express my feeling and it also expresses my thought. But to be able to reason with my feeling or my feeling to submit to the dictates of the mind is practically impossible. And whatever, whoever wins, it happens to be the strongest.

If it is represented, you might say, as man and woman, if one assumes that a woman is a little bit more predominant in an emotional sense,

and a man in an intellectual sense, there is a tremendous amount of fighting between them. Many times, and no solution. Not even in marriage. And that I would say gives an indication of the state of man as he is. But if he takes himself individually and if he is really interested in objectivity, and if then with this I, if it is developed, returns to his earth, his earth is his body, and his manifestations, there is a possibility that he develops in the real sense of the word and becomes then a man who can actually do and who knows and who can feel. With his emotions, man then becomes because of his balance in a conscious state, linked up with the possibility of a higher form of being, because he, himself, in the unity which he reaches by means of the change of negativity to positivity is able to become at times united as one, and in this wholeness he has a chance by means of his emotions to reach a higher level. The oneness means that he becomes free from his physical body. Well, don't let's talk too much any more about it.

Question: Could you talk about dreams?

Mr. Nyland: Well, dreams, the best dream, you know, is when one is awake. In an awakened state when one dreams about the possibility of objectivity. And that when you wake up, that you find yourself asleep. That's the best dream you can have. The other kind of dreams in ordinary physical sleep don't help you very much. What takes place in the physical state when you sleep, is that the three centers are a little bit disconnected. And if you rest well, they're more disconnected; they're practically free from each other. As a result, they're not controlled by each other, and the mind is much freer, and because of that kind of a freedom the different thoughts that have been located in it and now are called pigeonholed, put in there, have a certain amount of freedom by which they can move since they're not interfered

with.

You have to look at the mind, even if it is a very low state of let's say existence and almost, during one's sleep, is hibernating, there's still activity going on because the blood serves it and it is still alive. And it is like a circular motion in which at times certain things can simply be added to that, I call it a circular motion, it's like a table on which the different thoughts happen to come when it passes them. And that forms a dream in my consciousness quite haphazardly, without any particular rhyme or reason. And sometimes the things that come in a dream (we are) not even conscious about in ordinary life. But they come because they are a little bit loosened, and because of that kind of freedom they happen to be.

Again it is quite accidental. You never can dictate a dream or do anything with it. You cannot even stop it because there's not enough consciousness. And sometimes one can prevent dreams provided there's something in the brain that functions independently of the rest of the brain. If one has an I, one can stop dreams. And that becomes extremely important if one is really plagued by dreams or even by nightmares. Otherwise it's of very little use.

Naturally, a dream is made up of certain patterns of thought, and it's sometimes very interesting how they happen to be combined. And of course, as it is sometimes the result of that which one has experienced which is still very vivid, and you might say, which is still alive in one. And in the dream itself comes to the foreground because it is still so alive that it has not been forgotten and is not completely memory. So as a result of that, of course, I can have a thought as a dream, belonging to that which I have experienced. In the same way, if I anticipate, I can also have a dream which introduces the possibility of that what is going to happen, because I happen to think

about it. You see this is only a dream on the basis of life as it is now, and as we are, unconscious, on this earth.

There's a different form of dreams of which certain people are capable. It is a question for them in how far their particular mental functions have extrasensory perception. A possibility by which they can have or ^{CAN} be affected by conditions by which ordinary man is not affected by. One can say almost as if they are affected by certain currents which are outside of us and surrounding everyone, only they are adjusted to it because they are very sensitive. Mediums, people who are interested in psychic research, or people who have been trained to give the brain a certain facility of that kind. They can have dreams, and they are made up of facts which do not belong to their particular experience. Such facts sometimes can come from a different kind of level of existence. And in that kind of an existence there are certain things that can come in and can be reinterpreted by being put in a form which would become understandable to us.

I don't know how much you know about hypnotism or about media. But this is really what I'm talking about, that sometimes that kind of knowledge can become apparent in a dream, and then recalling the dream, one attaches a certain value to it, very often one doesn't know how much, because you're a little afraid of it and you don't want to reinterpret it because you may be wrong. But pre-vision belongs to that and can cause dreams, even in ordinary people, at certain times, if they happen to be in a state when that kind of excitement, I call it being excited, that is really alive, in a certain form of extra-sensitivity. It's interesting to bother a little bit about dreams. But you need many, many data. And before you can compare one dream of you with someone else, you have to have a special language for it. I say it's interesting because of very many experiments one can do,

when your dreams occur the beginning of the night or the later part. How much do particular thoughts influence a dream of a night? Do they appear at the time one wakes up, so at that moment the dream is lived through so at that moment time is of no particular value? All such things I think are quite interesting. But otherwise they're not useful for ordinary life. Now what else?

If you're interested in Gurdjieff and you come, then you have questions, I think. If you're not and you depend on me telling you all about everything, and as I say, that's rather difficult.

Question: Can a man one, two or three, according to Ouspensky, apply or use the Law of Seven or the Law of Three?

Mr. Nyland: The Law of Seven is the law of phenomena; it's the law of what you can see. That what occurs on earth. The Law of Three is the law of noumena; you cannot see, it is behind, it is something that exists and it probably makes the Law of Seven. In any event there is a certain distinction. Man number one, two and three have simply representations in the different centers they have, and in whatever they do in ordinary life, the Law of Seven maintains. Whatever they manifest and whatever they pursue, whatever they think and whatever they feel, they remain subject to the Law of Seven.

[illegible]

in one type of man, he goes around and it is like a spiral in which the circle gradually diminishes in radius and that he, himself is lifted up above that what was the first plane he was on.

So if I try now to find out what is the Law of Seven for me, I go and see if first find what is the important parts in that octave, which is fa and which is si-do. So if I want to find out more, I will try to find out if there is an initial do, is there a starting point. The thought, usually, the real wish of doing something. Starting at something that I now know that I want to do, and in that sense I strike in myself a do. I'm on my way, and the initial energy very often is enough to go through the do-re-mi. By do-re-mi I simply mean the ordinary things that I experience whenever I start, and it may require certain adjustments or perhaps a certain wish to follow up in the direction where the original do has been indicated that I ought to go. But many times the do-re-mi is as a triangle or a little triad, not so difficult for me because I can overcome little obstacles in an ordinary phenomenal world.

The first difficulty that I meet is when I'm asleep and I'm faced with the fact that there's apparently something that will make me return unless something special is happening. And that usually ~~mixx~~ that what I'm doing is do-re-mi, mi-re-do. I return constantly to that what is do. I get a new impetus, I do it again and I come back again. What is the fa bridge? The fa bridge is an octave (is, of course, as far as a ^{??} musical scale) is a one and a half. It is wider than the one note, and it has been caused by the shifting of the sol-la-si of the next triad, by shifting it a little bit towards the upper do. The reason for that kind of a shift in the phenomenal world as we know it is not in the world of tri(?), not in the world of tri-unity, but in a phenomenal world, the reason was for that events became important

for relationships between themselves.

You see, in order to maintain that which exists and not to allow it to run down, in its ordinary course or be destroyed, it would have to receive at certain points certain energies coming from other sources. And for that reason that what is now needed for the introduction of something from another source as energy or, as I say the connection of certain relationships between octaves, will enable then for an octave to come to its completion by itself, and ~~it~~ then again in that completion from do to do become reduced to a point and again start on its new cycle in a new kind of an octave. It takes too long to relate that and explain it more in detail but that is the substance of it; that a one and a half note exists simply because of the shifting of the si-la-si towards do and it causes two things, the note F was fa and became one and a half. The note between B and C in the ordinary scale or between si and do was reduced to half. The result of that particular condition is that the fa became less dense, the space. And between the si-do became more condensed. (So[?] that) now I have two difficulties to overcome; first a little (?), the do with which I start, and the fa which is the bridge which is now less dense, it means I cannot get across so easily unless I have extra energy. You see? This, of course, would be the implication or the reason why I call it something coming in from the outside to help me to overbridge, and with this extra energy, sometimes coming from a new do, from a new do from another octave, sometimes coming from the outside as something that happens to come my way.

But in reality, that what is really needed for man is to see the totality of his possible development from do to do. And his sole interest is (to accomplish) is that he is going from do to do and not be stuck on the way. And that the only satisfaction he will have when he reaches

the under do. You see when he strikes the first do, he strikes an overtone and that overtone is the under do. And the very fact that he strikes more than one note means that his progress has to be in the direction of the overtone.

For that reason ^{he} has to overcome fa and has to overcome si-do. In order to produce for him a condition that he can get across fa for which he needs more energy, he has to consider himself as the totality of the development from do to do and consider what is the condition of si-do. Si-do for him is a binding force which keeps him from reaching do. It is, as you might say, the final point at which a person is not willing to give up, to die. And he holds on to life, much more intense than he ever did in the very beginning. It simply means that at si-do, when it is condensed, there is more energy available than is needed. And if it can be overbridged, you might say, or dissolved, or if really the freedom would start to be attached there that more energy is available simply because it has been condensed before. Also, because of its condensation it is much more difficult, because it is compact.

But assuming then for a moment that I say I will want to reach si-do and do, then I consider the necessity of my inner state, considering the real wish that I want to accomplish what I have started as the initial do, from starting point, with that I produce in me a wish. As a result then I will have an atmosphere because the wish will extend outside of me. You see, if I really wish, I create a world, and this world starts to function and one of the functions of the world is that it will expand. Because of that, that what now takes place at mi, at the point, the consideration of si-do and the extent of energy as represented by my, you might say, intensified wish, create an atmosphere at si-do in which there is more possibility of any forces from outside will

enter.

With other words, the openness, as caused by the thought and feeling of si-de, produces in fa the condition by which I will receive more energy than before. This will enable me to cross over into sol. You see the fa is emotional state. The fa has to do with the planets. The planets are emotions in one's life. The planets in the world as we know it in our solar system is simply exactly the same microcosmically as the microcosmos of our own. When I consider myself as I am, physically, I am earth. Emotionally I am the planets. Intellectually I am the sun. So now what happens when I cross over from re and mi to fa, through fa to sol? I cross over by emotional states. This is the upheaval you might say, and bound together with my real wish to grow further. And then I reach sol. Sol is the sun. I reach an intellectual capacity for himself, in the development in which that what is my thought and that what has caused me originally to have the wish to start, because it has to be mental unless it is impulsive or intuitive; it nevertheless is an intellectual decision on my part that I want to grow or that I want to accomplish something. This sol now is affecting the totality of my further wish to become ultimately free. And the sol, ~~la~~ la-si again as a triad is overbridged very quick because the sol, la and si are almost equal, and there is sufficient, let's call it dynamic force, to make it as a triad into one, so it doesn't matter which side comes to the foreground. But again my problem is si. And at si there is the final solution of how to receive this particular problem of freedom that I always will have whenever anything has to be accomplished.

If it's a question of life and death, it takes place at si-de. If it's a question of creation it also takes place at si-de. And if I continue to consider that what I wish as a self-expression to be ex-

pressed in my creation, I have a terrible time to cross si-do. But when I am at the point, at C, consider that what I create as not belonging primarily to me, but you might say that it happens that I was an instrument or a channel, because of that, I will have that freedom of letting it go. Then I will accomplish it. You see, this is the Law of Seven.

The Law of Three is intertwined with it. I say it is back of it. It is something that belongs to it. It also furnishes at a certain time the forces necessary for the maintenance of the 1, 4, 2, 8, 5, 7. The points of the scale is do, fa and si-do. That is the Law of Three in the Law of Seven. And it simply means that that which is required as far as energies are concerned, are dependent on the points do, fa and si-do, or represented by the enneagram as 9, 3 and 6. So that whenever 9 is connected with 3 and 3 with 6, and 6 again with 9, that what goes through the circle and is like a segment crosses the 1, 4, 2, 8, 5, 7 line at two points. At these points where it crosses, that which is phenomena is stimulated by the noumena, and it receives from that constant, dynamic force, circulating as 9, 3, 6 continued in a form of life --- for you see life has to be dynamic && forms then at the point where it crosses the ordinary lines of the Law of Seven, I say the 1, 4, 2, 8, 5, 7 figure on the circumference of the enneagram --- as you remember --- you remember the enneagram well enough, don't you. 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8, then the 1-4-2 crossing over so that at any time that it goes from one to four it crosses the triangle twice.

You see, it is a little more complicated, of course, than that. These at a point at which the fa and the si-do furnish real energy to the triads as represented by the do-re-mi and the sol-la-si. The do-re-mi is 1-4-2. The sol-laaa la-si is 8-5-7, as far as the enneagram is concerned. It means that the do-re-mi belongs to the physical body, be-

tween 9 and 3 and half of the emotional body between 3 and 6. You see 1-4-2 stays on the right side of the enneagram. It doesn't cross. That is where man is in an unconscious state. When he crosses over to 6-5-7, he goes over to his intellect (that is 8) because the last segment between 6 and 9 is intellectual segment. He crosses to 8 which is his soul. He again is his emotional state which is 5, which belongs to the lower part of that cycle and goes up again to 7. From 7 he crosses over back again. He goes between his unconscious and his conscious state and the Law of Three helps him to maintain the relationship between one tried and the other. And when finally si-de is reached at the end of the cycle 1-4-2-8-5-7, that what has gone around once in the enneagram, according to the triangle, also again has reached nine. And both as you might say are ready to start at nine for the Law of Three and at one for the Law of Seven.

You understand what I mean, it is a little difficult if I don't draw it and I assume that you can visualize it well enough. But it is very interesting to see how they are connected and how there is that kind of an actual law in existence, and that the Law of Three becomes the law of consciousness and the Law of Seven the law of unconsciousness. Try to imagine the enneagram divided by a line in the center, as if on the right side of that is unconscious man and conscious man on the left side, so that that which has to be done is by flipping it over and making that which is unconscious, conscious. Or reversing it (that which is conscious, unconscious) to be put on the unconscious and making the unconscious conscious. But the division is the interesting part, the point between 3 and 6, or a little further between that what is 4 and 5. They are not related. It simply means that there is no relation between intellect and feeling. And that feeling as such is only half, because a little bit goes to 4. It is the de-re-mi of Kaddan which only exists,

and the sel-la-el of Keedjan does not exist. And that in order to reach from this point, physical, to that point intellectual that one only can reach emotion by going down on this side, then coming across on the intellectual side, and then go down to number 5.

I'm afraid I've lost you, hunh?

Question: I'm sorry.

Mr. Nyland: But you see, I assume in many of these things that you do know something about work and of course, that you've read Guspensky? It's probably the wrong assumption, because we call this an open meeting so maybe you'll get enough, however --- something that is inherent in these ideas and I hope it stimulate you, so that maybe because of that you will read a little bit more and try to find out what it's all about. Of course it's worth while. It is a system, a philosophy, surely a psychology. It is quite definitely helpful in understanding man the way he is, and what he might become, what he is now potentially. It has definitely a place in the cosmology, it has a place in religion? It has a place in ordinary relationships on earth, with men, how they are, even as types. ~r the differences, you might say, astrologically, between different signs of the Zodiac?

All these things are in Gurdjieff if you only can find them. And that it is necessary to dig, of course. Why should a treasure be so obvious? You have to work for it, you have to work, I call it, for a living. Because, really, in an unconscious state, all you do is exist. And it is too bad because that kind of a form of existence, of course, dies when you die? If that is satisfactory, you don't bother about trying to become conscious. But if it leaves a little bit of a problem, or something of a question mark, (and that the man who becomes interested in work really has to be a question mark)? That is his figure, that's the way this posture should be. And that because of this kind of work, thi

question mark straightens out and becomes a Man, standing straight and then perhaps with his face looking up, expecting that what he could become and what he will be if he is becoming a Man, that what he should be on a higher level, hoping then that what might give him strength to continue on earth will come from a level which he wishes to reach, if he could develop to his consciousness.

You see, I say, I assume that you do know but, of course, it's the wrong assumption. Maybe you don't, maybe you don't know anything about it, maybe you don't even wish. Maybe you do wish. My suggestion is try to find out, to settle a question if you want to. If you don't know enough, you have no right to have any opinion. If you try it out and you might say study it and become acquainted with it, at least you can form an opinion. And a reasonable one.

Well, don't ever go off and judge about Gurdjieff when you don't know a thing about it. That of course, is, scientifically speaking, already wrong, but definitely so prejudiced and so infantile that it shouldn't have any particular place in you. A person who's scientifically inclined at least modestly reasonable and has enough common sense, he ought to be open-minded enough to see what is meant by the word objectivity, if that is something that strikes him --- if he does not know that everything he's doing is completely subjective. And that, of course, the acquisition of anything objective, let alone the faculty and growth of something that one calls an I, is almost an impossibility for man. And still because of that, being adventurous in spirit it should really intrigue him to try to find out what he can do. If then you can get some results, or at least, if you hope, and there is something that is worth while, maybe you can stay with it, maybe you can exhaust it. You will never be able to, but in any event you can try.

My suggestion is simply get hold of something that has something

to do with you. Read some books --- take Guspensky, it's all right. Take All and Everything: it's much better. It's much more difficult, but it is Gurdjieff. Guspensky was not Gurdjieff. Guspensky was just a little pupil, you know. Nothing special about him. A Gurdjieff was a Man. He knew. And he could tell. And he did tell. And he took the time to tell. He had a purpose and an aim in his life. Guspensky never could get rid of Guspensky. Gurdjieff was free. Of course, in my opinion, Gurdjieff was conscious. he was a real Man who did know. But his heart was capable of it.

But there's no use talking about "an if you can talk about what he has left, and if that is the book as the first series, and All and Everything, and if his recommendation is to read it three times, which of course, is a good recommendation. If you read it in the ~~xx~~ correct way, simply as interest for the first time, for the second time read it as if you were reading it aloud, ~~xx~~ or to read it aloud as if you are reading it for someone else. The best thing is to read it aloud and know that it is there. And then if you want to enunciate and really let that what you are reading penetrate into you, maybe you can get something. If you read it for the first time, I'm quite sure that when you start for the second time you will be a little different. And with a little difference, that is something that might take place in your mind while you are trying to digest ~~xxx~~ certain things, you become a little bit of a different man. Maybe because of that you will look and will receive the ideas of the book in a different way. When you read it for the third time, that is the real time. That's the time for yourself. That's the time you come to grips with it. That's the time you probably will read it over and over again and not want to let it loose because you know, maybe he's feeling you a little bit --- maybe he has made it difficult intentionally, maybe there is something hidden that

And then if it could become for you, with an understanding of what is meant by these descents, this description of different events on earth, description of man, and that you could see it really as an impartial criticism of man as he is, unconscious as he is, fulfilling his life the way he does --- and that, you might say, like the first series, indicating simply the beginning of that what is required in order to bring down prejudice all of us have, and with that, Remarkable Men, and maybe a second series, it will give you an indication of how such men could exist who were, certainly, more conscious than any one of us.

The reason ~~you~~^{they} can't find a one is because you don't really search. You don't wish enough. When you really wish, it is like a prayer of oneself, in which all three centers become united, and in that particular entity, this unit of oneself, that is being heard by whatever force

is above us or higher than us, or as Gurdjieff would call it, His Endlessness. And that will be heard and will be acted on. Maybe not in the sense of the kind of prayer that you usually will take because you will wish something for yourself, and that even if you say "not my will but thine", you really don't mean it, because you may be asking for nice weather, or a better ~~xxx~~ relationship with your wife. You see, one asks in prayer for light, one asks for being awake. One asks, then, when one is awake, that God, then, "is Endlessness, will be able to tell you, because it is light, to tell you the relationships of how they are, and with that, then with that kind of an information, you have a possibility of really becoming more and more of a man in being that what should be conscious in the real sense, and having a conscience with which you can measure and the strength of a will with which you will persevere, in your further search for wishing to understand what really, in your own case, in each one of us, is the aim of one's existence. Gradually becoming aware of that what is the purpose of one's life. So if you do --- ah, just at the end, isn't it? So read as much as you can, I hope you remain interested.

Goodnight everybody.

and